

That is the power to determine whether those moneys, not in the view of some bureaucrat in Washington but in the view of the elected officials and law enforcement officers in their community, should be spent on one program or another, prevention, law enforcement.

That, Mr. Speaker, is precisely, is precisely, Mr. Speaker, why the results of the election on November 8 were so profound. The will of the people has been heard. It was heard in the halls of the Committee on the Judiciary this week, and will indeed result, I hope, Mr. Speaker, in passage of these important crime measures in just a few days ahead.

#### SUPPORT THE CHILD RESPONSIBILITY ACT, MAKING BOTH PARENTS RESPONSIBLE FOR CHILD SUPPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHood). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise tonight to speak about that critical aspect of the welfare reform that is overlooked by the Contract With America. I'm talking about child support.

The contract spells out the exact punishments for women on AFDC. Women under 18 will be ineligible for assistance if they have a child out of wedlock. Women will not receive additional benefits if they have another child while on welfare. Women will be forced off welfare after 2 years, whether or not they have found employment or completed a training program.

Is this a personal responsibility act, or a female punishment act? Not once is the responsibility of the father mentioned in the contract. In fact, the only mention of fathers denies public assistance to the child if paternity is not established. That is an astonishing oversight.

Today, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], has already pointed out, 63 percent of absent parents contribute no child support. Out of the \$48 billion which should be paid annually only \$14 billion is actually collected. Millions of families could escape welfare if only they received the owed child support.

The child support enforcement system in my State of Massachusetts is a model for successful collection. In the 1980's, then Governor Dukakis made child support payments a top priority. Governor Weld built on that foundation the toughest, most streamlined child support collection system in the country.

Massachusetts has been able to effectively garnish the wages, bank accounts, unemployment claims, and the lottery winnings of child support avoiders. In the last 6 months, these new laws have helped 4,000 families escape AFDC and saved Massachusetts \$38.5 million.

The Massachusetts system is effective because it is centralized and unempllicated. Only one office deals with child support payments, and there are no forms to fill out. But this system works best if the noncustodial parent lives and works within the Massachusetts border. If the parent has crossed State lines, the support order is unlikely to be paid.

We need a national system of child support. We need more cooperation and coordination between States. We need to create a national registry of child support orders.

Tougher child support enforcement is a concrete way to achieve personal responsibility of fathers for the children they conceive. Under the contract, fathers remain totally unaccountable, while mothers must sacrifice and are subjected to sometimes harsh reforms.

This is a clear double standard that I urge my colleagues in this Congress to rectify. Our support of the Child Responsibility Act would show that we believe both mothers and fathers should be held responsible for the economic well-being of their children.

#### OPPOSITION TO THE MEXICAN BAILOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again voice my opposition to the Mexican bailout, and especially to the way in which it is being done.

I have frequently said that today we have a Federal Government that is of, by, and for the bureaucrats, instead of one that is of, by, and for the people. But even I did not realize how little control the people of this Nation now have over their own National Government.

Once again we see the arrogance, the elitism, the public be damned, Big Brother knows best attitude of the powerful people who run this Government.

Because of the overwhelming opposition of the American people to this Mexican bailout, the President did what has been described as an end run around Congress.

Apparently, he found that the votes were not there, even though the politically correct vote, the "anything to gain the approval of the national media vote" would have been to be for this bailout.

So the President and the big financial powers decided to come up with a plan that did not require congressional approval. This means that our Government is sending billions to Mexico even though everyone knows the vast majority of our people are opposed to it.

This is the most undemocratic—with a small "d"—thing I have seen during my slightly over 6 years in Congress. It flies in the face of the will of the American people.

Big Government liberals have long had the belief or philosophy that Gov-

ernment knows best—that the people really don't know how to run their own lives or spend their own money.

This latest action—sending this money to Mexico—is just another example of big government spending the people's money in a way that most Americans do not want. And boy are we talking money here—billions, with a "b."

A few weeks ago, through the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve, we provided \$9 billion of an \$18 billion package to prop up the peso. That wasn't enough.

Now, the President has announced he is taking \$20 billion from the Exchange Stabilization Fund, even though this money was designed to stabilize our own currency and even though it has never before been used to prop up the money of a foreign country.

Also, we are using \$20 billion of the \$25 billion in this fund, thus placing our own money in a less secure status.

In addition, Mexico will receive \$17.8 billion from the International Monetary Fund, the largest loan in the Fund's 50-year history. Who is the largest contributor to the IMF? The U.S. taxpayer of course.

Then we are sending \$10 billion more from the Bank for International Settlements.

Billions and billions and billions—and all this at a time when the Heritage Foundation says Mexico already owes us over \$70 billion that they cannot now and probably never will repay.

The big Wall Street and International investors bought Mexican bonds paying 25 and 30 percent interest rates. They certainly did not share their profits with U.S. taxpayers, but now they want us to protect them from losses for their foolish risks.

Even a liberal like A.M. Rosenthal, the New York Times columnist, has come out strongly against this deal.

Last Friday, he wrote:

Could it be that the administration had so enthusiastically promoted Mexico that it would have been terribly embarrassing—an election coming up and all—to disclose that Mexico "suddenly" could not go on backing up its pesos and bonds unless the United States offered heavy loans to bail out investors?

And then he wrote, while we were still talking about just \$40 billion in loan guarantees—instead of the more lavish deal we now have:

Economic aid is often justified, but not 40 billion dollars to a country whose mess was created by the cowardice of bureaucrats and the mistakes of investors, theirs and ours. Americans would be foolish—I am being exquisitely polite today—if they agreed to any loan before they found out which American and Mexican investors would be the big beneficiaries.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, our Federal Government has shown that only the rich, the powerful, the wealthy, and those who work for the Government truly benefit from Big Government.